

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

LAW OFFICES  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

JUN 29 2005

Telephone  
(202) 434-1500

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Facsimile  
(202) 434-1501

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

November 17, 2004

TO : U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK

ATTN: Examiner Duc Q. Dinh

GROUP UNIT NO.: 2674

FAX NO.: 703-872-9306

TELEPHONE:

FROM: H.J. Staas

RE: Serial No.: 09/974,806

OUR DOCKET: 1872.1003CIPC2 (Formerly 122.1052CIPC2)

NO. OF PAGES (Including this Cover Sheet) 3

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, and is intended only for the use of the addressee(s). Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited. If there are any problems with this transmission, please contact us immediately.

COMMENTS:

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,  
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
on June 29, 2005  
STAAS & HALSEY  
By: H. J. Staas  
Date June 29, 2005

Jun-29-05 08:23pm From STAAS & HALSEY

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

T-634 P.002/003 F-347

Serial No. 09/974,806

JUN 29 2005

Docket No.: 1872.1003CIPC2 (Formerly 122.1052CIPC2)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the Application of:

Shigetoshi TOMIO, et al.

Serial No. 09/974,806

Group Art Unit: 2674

Confirmation No. 8860

Filed: October 12, 2001

Examiner: Duc Q. Dinh

For: FLAT DISPLAY PANEL HAVING INTERNAL POWER SUPPLY CIRCUIT FOR  
REDUCING POWER CONSUMPTION

**COMMUNICATION**

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Action mailed May 18, 2005 appears defective or least unclear in several respects.

**ITEM 9**

Item 9 of the Action purports to reject claims 9-12 and 22 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) over Criscimagna et al. – but in the paragraph spanning pages 3-4, instead, relies on Kurikko.

**QUERY**

Is Kurikko intended to be included in the rejection of Item 4?

Applicants note, on the other hand, that Kurikko is combined with Kanazawa in the rejection of Item 9.

**QUERY**

Was the discussion of Kurikko on pages 3-4 instead intended to be part of Item 5?

**ITEM 9: OBJECTION TO CLAIM 10 BUT INDICATION OF ALLOWABILITY OF CLAIM 10 IF REWRITTEN TO INDEPENDENT FORM.**

The indicated allowability of claim 10 is inconsistent with the rejection of claim 10 in Item 6 of the Office Action Summary and Item 4 of the Action.

QUERY

Is claim 10 allowable per item 9?

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, issuance of a replacement Office Action responding to the above status of QUERIES is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

*June 29, 2005*

By:

*H. J. Staas*  
H. J. Staas  
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents.

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on June 29, 2005

STAAS & HALSEY

By: *Paul M. Lis*

Date June 29, 2005